THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

W.P.NO.15655 OF 2007

O R D E R (Per the Hon'ble Smt. Justice T.Meena Kumari)

Heard the petitioner, who is party-in-person.

2. From the bulky material papers filed by the petitioner it could be seen that the petitioner was initially appointed as Lower Division Clerk in the Civil Supplies Department at Hyderabad on 21.3.1974 and subsequently after his regularization and further promotion, while he was working as Deputy Tahsildar in Civil Supplies Department, he filed O.A.No.7069/1996 to declare the seniority granted to the respondents 5 and 6 therein, in the Deputy Tahsildar category, as illegal and for fixation of seniority for his promotion as Deputy Tahsildar with effect from 7.6.1982 and Tahsildar with effect from 7.6.1985 etc. By order dated 30.7.1997, the Tribunal directed the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner along with other eligible officers in the department for promotion to the post of Civil Supplies Tahsildar from 1988, the year in which the official respondents promoted the unofficial respondents as Civil Supplies Tahsildars. Aggrieved by the same, the respondents 8 and 11 before the Tribunal, filed W.P.No.29755/1997 and the Civil Supplies Department filed W.P.No.34772/1997 and the petitioner herein also filed another W.P.No.33550/1997 insofar as it relates to further promotions from the post of Tahsilder. This court, by common order dated 14.12.2003, held that the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of promotion to the post of Tahsildar with effect from 4.2.1988 and other consequential promotions to the posts of DSO, Additional Director, Deputy Director etc., on the basis of the said date and consequently while allowing the W.P.Nos.29775 and 34772 of 1997, dismissed the writ petition in W.P.No.33550/1997, filed by the petitioner. Challenging the order of the Division Bench of this Court, the petitioner carried the matter to the Apex Court in S.L.P.No.6081 to 6083 of 2004 and by order dated 5.4.2004, the Apex Court dismissed the special leave petitions.

3. In the earlier round of litigation, the petitioner has not made the official respondents as parties, by name. But in the present writ petition by impleading the officials respondents by name, the petitioner is seeking to fix his seniority and for other directions. As already noted above, the petitioner has sought the relief claimed in the present writ petition in the earlier round of litigation and the matter was also carried to the Apex Court and the Apex Court has dismissed the S.L.Ps. filed by the petitioner. Again, for the same relief with regard to fixation of seniority etc., the present writ petition is filed, which is not maintainable and this amounts to abuse of process of law. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed at the stage of admission.

T.MEENA KUMARI,J

G.CHANDRAIAH, J

Note:

1. Issue C.C. by 30.7.07
2. The registry shall return the material papers to the petitioner.

B/O